

AUG 3 1966

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500310005-1

*"VIII. Strike risks*

"The bill provides that the Work Rules Disputes Board, in its recommendations, may provide that employees who strike in protest of the recommendation may be denied any part of the job protection provisions contained in its decision."

Mr. Monse. Mr. President, I close with this final statement about what I believe is really involved in the crisis that has been created by this case. We in this country must make up our minds whether we shall preserve economic freedom by preserving the precious right to bargain collectively; the precious right on the part of management to resort to economic force by way of a lockout, if it wants to follow that course of action; the precious right of workers to band together and refuse to offer their services in concern and engage in a strike.

Many persons like to dismiss these abstract rights. But I would have Congress and the people of the country reflect on the kind of country we would have if those rights were lost to free employers and to free workers.

It may be said, "Oh, you are whistling while walking by a graveyard. There is no danger of that. Stop deluding yourself."

But there are people in other countries and in other civilizations who took the same position, the position that they could not lose their freedom. But it happened.

There are many ugly dangers in this country today that are attacking our freedoms from many angles. There are in this country extremists who want to invest in the police of the country, including the police of the District of Columbia, police-state powers that would destroy the basic rights of freedom. They want to take away the protection of the Supreme Court in such fact situations as the Mallory case. Another group of extremists seeks to vest more and more unchecked power in the American military.

I have heard it said—and I repeat today, and it is apropos the subject matter of the protection of freedom which is so basically involved in this proposed legislation—"Be on guard, for it can happen in the United States that a military power can become so strong that free institutions and constitutional procedures become endangered."

Mr. President, those of us who have been battling on the floor of the Senate for the past few years against the unchecked power of the CIA are really fighting to preserve for the people the precious principle of our system of checks and balances, for in a democracy there is no room for unchecked power be any agency of government or any group within our citizenry.

Some may ask, "What does this have to do with this joint resolution?" The answer is, "Everything"—as Senators will realize if they reflect upon the major premise of my argument. I am arguing against the unchecked exercise of compulsory power on economic freedom. If the wall of protection which Americans have enjoyed all these years in the field of management-labor relations is broken through by a compulsory-arbitration hammer drive such as this joint resolution can, in my judgment, properly be said to constitute, we shall start to tear down the wall of economic freedom for management and labor which has been built up to protect them from the exercise of arbitrary power by the Government—in this instance, by a compulsory arbitration board representing the Government.

Mr. President, the preservation of these abstract principles of government will determine whether Americans remain free. When we read history, we find that the first step taken by police states is destruction of the economic freedom of the workers and managers; and usually they do it with unchecked military power.

So, Mr. President, as a constitutional liberal, I offer this amendment to the committee amendment. I know it has been argued that this is a rather complex amendment. Of course it is. But freedom is complex, too; and freedom is worth whatever price we have to pay to protect it. I will not vote today for such a precedent, even though an attempt is made to limit it to this case, for it cannot be limited to this case. Although Senator after Senator has gone through the verbal form of trying to assure himself that the proposal now confronting us will not establish a precedent, no Senator can assure himself or anyone else that it will not establish a precedent. Of course it will establish a precedent, Mr. President—and an exceedingly dangerous one. Who knows where it will lead? It should not be established, because it never should be followed. But precedents are followed; that is one of the ugly things about bad precedents.

So I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by saying that I care not whether I am the only Senator who will vote against this joint resolution or whether I am the only one who will vote for this amendment to the committee amendment. I will stand on the record I am making today for future reference in support of the preservation of economic freedom for management and labor, and in opposition to a precedent of compulsory arbitration set by this very unwise and shocking joint resolution.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500310005-1